



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,831	09/13/2006	Toong Chuan Yong	1237.P006US/GDL/jt	1973
38556 7590 08/27/2009 LAWRENCE Y.D. HO & ASSOCIATES PTE LTD 30 BIDEFORD ROAD, #02-02, THONGSIA BUILDING SINGAPORE, 229922 SINGAPORE				
EXAMINER				
KATCHEVES, BASIL S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3635				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/27/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/598,831

Applicant(s)

YONG ET AL.

Examiner

BASIL KATCHEVES

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 19-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 19-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 September 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the finishing steps must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claims are objected to because of the following informalities: Improper english. Appropriate correction is required.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Claim 22 recites the limitation "the one side" and "the shorter side (rail)" in 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 23 recites the limitation "the one side" and "the longer side (stile)" in 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-3,12,14-16,19 and 22 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,478,469. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Claims 1-3,12,14-16 and 22 are substantially similar to claim 1 of '469.

Claim 19 is substantially similar to claim 5 of '469.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12, 14-17, 19-20, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,589,240 to Kendall et al.

Regarding claims 1 and 14, Kendall discloses a door panel (abstract) made of two skins, one overlaying the other, with profiled edges engaging each other (fig. 1: 18 and 18a) forming a channel (see area between edges) and a locking means (20c) inside the channel. However, Kendall does not particularly disclose the use of the panel being mounted to a work surface. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a work surface since there would be no other reasonable way to assemble the panels. A work surface could be a various machinery or table surfaces commonly found in factories or on-site work spaces.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 15 and 16, Kendall discloses the panel as a door (abstract).

Regarding claim 4, the method step of sliding one skin over the other is not particularly disclosed. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to slide one side into the other since the channels are shaped to snap over or slide into engagement, or both. This would be an obvious design choice.

Regarding claim 5 Kendall shows one skin over the other.

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Kendall does not disclose the metal skins as distorted but does disclose the metal channels as tensioned in a resilient manner. The applicant should note that as claimed, the limitation of distorted, for claim 6, may be construed as tensioned (distorted) and for claim 7 may be construed as not bent (not distorted) out of shape.

Regarding claims 8 and 17, Kendall discloses the edges as complimenting each other on their engagement edges (end hooks).

Regarding claims 9 and 12, Kendall discloses the engagement members as brought together by the locking means (fig. 1) which holds the panel together.

Regarding claims 10 and 11, Kendall discloses the locking means as inherently permanent or non permanent (reversible) as a design choice since it can be dis-assembled. This is a desired function which it is capable of performing.

Regarding claims 19 and 20, Kendall discloses the locking means as having a bar shape wedged between skins.

Regarding claims 22 and 23, Kendall discloses one side as longer and one side as shorter (fig. 5).

Claims 13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,589,240 to Kendall et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,141,930 to Allwein et al.

Regarding claims 13 and 21, Kendall does not disclose the use of welding. Allwein discloses the use of welding on a structure with intermediate fastener (46). Regarding the limitations of finishing the door with paint, fasteners, ironmongery and capping ends, these limitations are inherent on most doors since to function as a door, hinges, screws and capped ends must be applied (as seen in figures 3 and 4 of Kendall). Painting a door is also obvious. Since Kendall teaches the panel as being a door (abstract), these features would be obvious to add to the bare panel in order to create a functioning door. Regarding the welds, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kendall by using welds as taught by Allwein in order to increase the strength of the structure.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The cited patents listed on the included form PTO-892 further show the state of the art with respect to door panels in general.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Basil Katcheves whose telephone number is (571) 272-6846. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm.

Art Unit: 3635

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Chilcot, can be reached at (571) 272-6777.

/Basil Katcheves/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3635